



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,815	09/07/2001	Heiner Bayha	VMP-491-A	3470

7590 12/09/2004
Andrew R Basile
Young & Basile
3001 West Big Beaver Road Suite 624
Troy, MI 48084

EXAMINER

YAM, STEPHEN K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2878

DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Ar

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/856,815	Applicant(s) BAYHA ET AL.	
	Examiner Stephen Yam	Art Unit 2878	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2004.
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-22 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-22 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Amendments and remarks filed on September 28, 2004. Claims 1-8 and 11-22 are currently pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by O'Farrell et al. US Patent No. 4,973,844.

Regarding Claim 19, O'Farrell et al. teach (see Fig. 1 and 2) a device for detecting particles on a windshield of a motor vehicle, comprising a radiation source (39) that emits optical rays onto the windshield (12), a beam receiver (170) that receives reflections of at least a portion of the rays emitted onto the windshield (see Col. 5, lines 40-45 and Col. 6, lines 30-34), and a control unit (34) that selectively controls at least one of an intensity, a duration and a frequency of a first ray emitted by the radiation source (see Col. 6, lines 30-32) and is operable to analyze the reflections of the first ray and to identify a type of the particles (see Col. 14, lines 1-29) based upon the at least one of the intensity, the duration, or the frequency of the first ray (see Col. 6, lines 43-45) and characteristic reflections of known pulses (see Col. 6, lines 50-62).

Regarding Claim 20, O'Farrell et al. teach the radiation source as a light emitting diode (see Col. 5, lines 38-40).

Regarding Claim 21, O'Farrell et al. teach the beam receiver comprising a plurality of receiver units (see Fig. 1 and 2).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. US Patent No. 4,636,643 in view of Hochstein US Patent No. 4,798,956.

Regarding Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 17, Nakamura et al. teach a device for detecting particles on a windshield (2) of a motor vehicle with a radiation source (1) (see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) which emits optical rays onto the windshield, a photodetector (5 or 9) which receives a portion of the rays emitted onto the windshield, and a single control unit (7, 10) (containing a first controller (7) and a second controller (10)) which manages the radiation source and analyzes the rays received by the photodetector, characterized in that the radiation source is positioned outside the field of vision of a driver of the vehicle (see Fig. 1) and is aligned in such a way that the light rays from the radiation source strike the windshield in the area of the field of vision, and that the photodetector is pointed at the area of the windshield which the optical rays from the radiation source strike (see Fig. 1), and wherein the single control unit is operable to control the radiation source to emit a first ray (see Col. 3, lines 59-61) and is operable to analyze the first ray for purposes of detecting the presence of particles (fog is defined as " vapor condensed to fine

Art Unit: 2878

particles of water" according to Merriam-Webster's Dictionary) on the windshield of the motor vehicle when at least a portion of the first ray is received by the photodetector (see Col. 3, line 62 to Col. 4, line 2 and Col. 4, lines 24-32). Regarding Claim 2, Nakamura et al. teach the radiation source formed as a light emitting diode (see Col. 3, line 30). Regarding Claims 3 and 4, Nakamura et al. teach the photodetector including several receiving units (5) and formed as optoelectronic arrays (see Col. 3, lines 63-65). Regarding Claims 5 and 6, Nakamura et al. teach a lens (see Col. 3, line 34-37) located in the direction of propagation of the beams reflected from the particles in front of the receiving units for focusing the beams. Regarding Claim 8, Nakamura et al. teach the radiation source emitting optical rays with a wavelength in the infrared range (see Col 3, lines 27-33). Regarding Claim 9, Nakamura et al. teach the control unit (7 and 10) managing the radiation source (see Col. 3, lines 59-61) in such a way that the type of particles can be determined from the rays received by the photodetector. Nakamura does not teach the single control unit selectively controlling at least one of an intensity, duration, and frequency of the first ray emitted by the radiation source and to perform the analysis including identifying a type of the particles, based, at least in part, on the one of the previously controlled intensity, duration, and frequency of the first ray. Hochstein teaches (see Fig. 1 and 6) a similar device, wherein a single control unit (see Fig. 6) is operable to selectively control (44) at least one of an intensity, duration, and frequency (see Col. 7, lines 10-32) of a first ray emitted by a radiation source and is operable to analyze the first ray for detecting the presence of particles on the windshield of the motor vehicle (see Col. 7, lines 55-61 and Col. 8, lines 15-20) and for identifying a type of the particles (see Col. 7, lines 55-61 and Col. 8, lines 15-20) when at least a portion of the first ray is received by the photodetector based, at least in part, on the at least one

Art Unit: 2878

of the previously controlled intensity, duration, and frequency of the first ray (see Col. 7, line 55 to Col. 8, line 2 and Col. 8, lines 52-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to control the intensity, duration, or frequency of a ray from the radiation source and perform the analysis including identifying a type of the particles, based, at least in part, on the intensity, duration, and frequency control as taught by Hochstein in the device of Nakamura et al., to provide enhanced recognition of windshield particle matter to provide additional functionality for the system and reduce the occurrences of false detection of particles.

Regarding Claim 12, Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein teach the device in Claim 1, according to the appropriate paragraph above. Nakamura et al. do not teach the device as an integral part of a rearview mirror module in the vehicle. Hochstein also teaches (see Fig. 2) the device as an integral part of a rearview mirror module (32) in the vehicle. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the device of Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein with a rearview mirror module in the vehicle as taught by Hochstein, to enable visual access to the windshield without interfering with the visual acuity of the driver, as taught by Hochstein (see Col. 5, lines 62-64).

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein as applied to Claim 1, further in view of Koyama et al. US Patent No. 6,285,037.

Regarding Claim 7, Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein teach the device in Claim 1, according to the appropriate paragraph above. Nakamura et al. do not teach the radiation source

Art Unit: 2878

emitting optical rays with a wavelength of 350-800nm. Koyama et al. teach (see Fig. 1 and 2) a device (1) for detecting particles on a windshield (G) of a motor vehicle with a radiation source (4) which emits optical rays onto the windshield (see Fig. 2) and a photodetector (5) which receives a portion of the rays emitted onto the windshield, wherein the radiation source emits optical rays having a wavelength of 700nm to 780nm (see Col. 1, lines 63-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to emit optical rays having wavelength of about 350nm to 800nm as taught by Koyama et al. in the device of Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein, to improve detection for windshields with high infrared absorbances, as taught by Koyama et al. (see Col. 2, lines 33-40).

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein as applied to Claim 1, further in view of Breed et al. US Patent No. 5,845,800.

Regarding Claim 11, Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein teach the device in Claim 1, according to the appropriate paragraph above. Nakamura et al. does not teach the device as an integral part of an interior light module in the vehicle. Breed et al. teach an optical sensor device for a vehicle with a field of view of the windshield (see Fig. 1D) of a vehicle wherein the sensor is mounted by an interior light module in the vehicle. It is well known in the art to integrate two adjacent components into a single larger housing, to provide simple attachment and greater protection. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the device of Breed et al. by an interior light module in the vehicle as taught by Breed et al. and integrate it with the interior light module in the device of Nakamura

Art Unit: 2878

et al. in view of Hochstein, to provide the device with direct visual access to the windshield in the area of the field of vision and out of the field of vision of a driver of the vehicle and to improve the durability and assembly ease of the device.

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein as applied to Claim 1, further in view of O'Farrell et al.

Regarding Claim 14, Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein teach the device in Claim 1, according to the appropriate paragraph above. Hochstein also teaches the control unit detecting dirt on the windshield (see Col. 8, lines 15-20). Nakamura et al. do not teach the control unit associated with a windshield cleaning system such that the windshield cleaning system is activated when the control unit detects dirt on the windshield. O'Farrell et al. teach (see Fig. 1 and 2) a similar device, wherein a control unit detects the presence of particles on a windshield of a motor vehicle and identifies a type of the particles (see Col. 14, lines 1-29), wherein the control unit associated with a windshield cleaning system such that the windshield cleaning system is activated when the control unit detects dirt on the windshield (see Col. 14, lines 20-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrate the device with a windshield cleaning system as taught by O'Farrell et al. in the device of Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein, to provide automatic windshield cleaning upon necessity without driver intervention.

Art Unit: 2878

8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein as applied to Claim 2, further in view of Stam et al. US Patent No. 5,923,027.

Regarding Claim 16, Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein teach the device in Claim 2, according to the appropriate paragraph above. Nakamura et al. do not teach the light emitting diode as emitting optical rays having different wavelengths. Stam et al. teach a similar device for detecting particles on a windshield of a motor vehicle with a radiation source (66) (see Fig. 2) which emits optical rays onto the windshield (see Fig. 3), a photodetector (32) which receives a portion of the rays emitted onto the windshield, and a control unit (see Col. 6, lines 6-15 and Col. 10, lines 32-34) which manages the radiation source and analyzes the rays received by the photodetector, wherein the radiation source is positioned outside the field of vision of a driver of the vehicle (see Fig. 3) and aligned in such a way that the light rays from the radiation source strike the windshield in the area of the field of vision, and that the photodetector is pointed at the area of the windshield which the optical rays from the radiation source strike (see Fig. 1 and 3), wherein the radiation source is a visible LED (see Col. 10, lines 59-60), which inherently possesses a plurality of wavelengths within a visible spectrum range. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the light-emitting diode to emit different wavelengths as taught by Stam et al. in the device of Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein, to provide improved detection according to the specific absorption characteristics of the windshield as taught by Stam et al. (see Col. 10, lines 22-24).

Art Unit: 2878

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein as applied to Claim 1, further in view of Hegyi US Patent No. 5,703,568.

Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein teach the device in Claim 1, according to the appropriate paragraph above. Nakamura et al. do not teach the device connected over a bi-directional data bus to a superordinate control unit in the vehicle. Hegyi teaches an image sensor for detecting particles on a windshield connected to a superordinate control unit (46) (see Fig. 3). Although Hegyi does not mention the connection of the device to the superordinate control unit over a bi-directional data bus, it is inherent that a data bus is used to convey data between the device and the superordinate control unit, and the superordinate control unit both sends and receives data bi-directionally to the device to obtain sensor data from the device and to control the device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the superordinate control unit over a bi-directional data bus of Hegyi with the device of Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein, to provide feedback for other vehicle functions and enable the activation and deactivation of the device.

10. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein as applied to Claim 1, further in view of Schofield et al. WO 99/23828.

Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein teach the device as taught in Claim 1, according to the appropriate paragraph above. Nakamura et al. do not teach the photodetector as a CCD array. Schofield et al. teach (see Fig. 2b and 6) a device for detecting particles on a windshield (19) comprising a light source (38) and a photodetector (36) receiving a portion of the rays emitted onto the windshield, wherein the photodetector is a CCD array (see Page 5, lines 29-32).

Art Unit: 2878

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a CCD image converter as the photodetector as taught by Schofield in the device of Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein, to provide imaging means for more accurate detection of the existence of particles on the windshield.

11. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein as applied to Claim 2, further in view of Teder.

Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein teach the device as taught in Claim 2, according to the appropriate paragraph above. Nakamura et al. do not teach the light emitting diode operable to emit optical rays having different intensities. Teder teaches (see Figs. 1 and 2) a similar device for detecting particles on a windshield of a vehicle with a radiation source (40/52) which emits optical rays onto the windshield (20) (see Col. 4, lines 9-10), wherein the radiation source is operable to emit optical rays having different intensities (see Col. 6, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the light emitting diode operable to emit optical rays having different intensities, as taught by Teder, in the device of Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein, to improve particle detection for windshields having different transmittances and compensate for changes in electronic components, as taught by Teder (see Col. 3, lines 4-7).

12. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein as applied to Claim 2, further in view of Breed et al.

Art Unit: 2878

Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein teach the device as taught in Claim 2, according to the appropriate paragraph above. Nakamura et al. do not teach the light emitting diode positioned such that the optical rays strike the windshield at a similar angle with respect to a driver's line of sight. Breed et al. teach (see Fig. 1D) a device where a light emitting diode (113) (see Col. 5, lines 51-52 and Col. 13, lines 3-4) is positioned such that the optical rays strike the windshield at a similar angle with respect to a driver's line of sight (see Fig. 1D), mounted by the interior light module of the vehicle (see Col. 13, lines 10-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to position the light emitting diode so the optical rays strike the windshield at a similar angle with respect to a driver's line of sight as taught by Breed et al. in the device of Nakamura et al. in view of Hochstein, to prevent the light from interfering with the driver's view on the windshield and hampering his/her driving abilities.

13. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Farrell et al. in view of Hochstein.

O'Farrell et al. teach the device in Claim 18, according to the appropriate paragraph above. O'Farrell et al. does not teach the radiation source, the beam receiver and the control unit mounted with an interior light module in the vehicle. Hochstein teaches (see Fig. 1 and 6) a similar device, wherein a radiation source (18), beam receiver (50), and control unit (48), wherein the radiation source, beam receiver, and control unit are mounted with an interior rearview mirror in the vehicle (see Col. 6, lines 26-28 and 58-64). O'Farrell et al. and Hochstein do not teach the rearview mirror as an interior light module. It is well known in the art to

Art Unit: 2878

combine a rearview mirror with an interior light module in a vehicle, to provide additional illumination concentrated towards the front area of the vehicle. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the radiation source, the beam receiver and the control unit mounted with an interior light module in the vehicle, with the teachings of Hochstein in the device of O'Farrell et al., to enable visual access to the windshield without interfering with the visual acuity of the driver, as taught by Hochstein (see Col. 5, lines 62-64), and to provide additional illumination for the convenience of the front vehicle passengers.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 and 11-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding Applicant's arguments that Nakamura does not teach a single control unit since the components (7) and (10) of Nakamura are not electrically coupled, Examiner asserts a single control unit can consist of multiple various components, each performing different operations for the control unit. Different components within a "control unit" are not necessarily electrically coupled, as they may perform independent functions and therefore do not require interaction. Therefore, Examiner contends that the combination of components (7) and (10) forms the "single control unit" as recited in the claim language.

Examiner also asserts that since although Applicant inserts the subject matter of previous Claim 9 into independent Claim 1, the metes and bounds of newly amended Claim 1 are more

Art Unit: 2878

specifically defined than previous Claim 9, as presently, the identification of a type of the particles is accomplished (using the control unit) *based, at least in part, on the at least one of the previously controlled intensity, duration, and frequency of the first ray* (see present Claim 1), whereas previous Claim 9 simply recited that the type of particles *can be* determined from the rays *received by the photodetector*. Therefore, according to previous Claim 9, the type of particles are neither specifically required to be identified through any operable means (due to the usage of "can be" language), nor necessarily determined/identified using the control unit, nor necessarily based, at least in part, on the at least one of the previously controlled intensity, duration, and frequency of the first ray. Therefore, Examiner asserts that the scope of present Claim 1 is more limiting than that of previous Claim 9, thereby necessitating a new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2878

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Yam whose telephone number is (571)272-2449. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Porta can be reached on (571)272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SY

SY


THANH X. LUU
PATENT EXAMINER